

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1089 presently stand rejected.

Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to because of informalities. The Examiner has requested that the phrase “vocal recognition” be replaced with the phrase --speech recognition--.

Applicant has amended the specification in this manner.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, and 9 are objected to because of informalities. In response, Applicant has amended these claims in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejection Under Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1-9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of co-pending application no. 10/508,794 in view of previously cited DeVito (US 6,254,536).

Claim 1

Applicant has amended claim 1 so that it recites features from previously presented claim 1 and also recites that the radioelectric waves have different frequencies and amplitude and are sent directly to the animal’s brain. This amendment is supported at least by the exemplary embodiment discussed at the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 and the first paragraph of page 8 of the original specification.

Because the system of claim 1 includes a pulse-generating means that sends radioelectric waves have different frequencies and amplitude directly to the animal’s brain, it is thus possible

to provide the fundamental information characterizing the acoustic structures of spoken language (i.e.: frequency, intensity, tone, intonation) to the animal's cerebral cortex. Therefore, the animal hears almost simultaneously the human voice and the radiofrequency signal (containing said fundamental information of the acoustic structures of spoken language), thus associating the two stimuli and allowing the animal to understand human language.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not obvious in view of any reasonable combination of the claims of co-pending application no. 10/508,794 (the '794 application) and DeVito.

The '794 application is directed to a voice connection system between humans and animals. For example, claim 1 of the '794 application includes a processing means that receives signals detected on the animal's body and activates a loudspeaker in order to emit a selected human voice message, in voice messages. The processing means also receives signals representative of vocal messages and sends corresponding stimuli to the animal's brain.

However, these claims do not recite that radioelectric waves sent to the animal's brain *have different frequencies and amplitude and are sent directly to the animal's brain*. The disclosure of the '794 application is likewise deficient.

Moreover, DeVito, which was cited by the Examiner as showing electroencephalographic and electromyographic signals, does not make up for this deficiency.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1.

Claim 2

Claim 2 has been amended to recited that the generator modulates a stead-state frequency at about 15 KHz with signals varying from 300 Hz to 4 KHz. This amendment is supported at least by the exemplary embodiment discussed at the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the original specification.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 2 at least because of its dependency from claim 1.

Claims 3-7

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 3-7 at least because of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim 8

With respect to claim 8, Applicant also traverses the rejection. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that "all the limitation of claim 8 of the present application are also present in claim 10 of Application No. 10/508,794."¹ (see page 6 of the Second Office Action).

In fact, claim 10 of the '794 application does not recite that second electric signals (i.e. signals representing the content of the voice messages uttered by a human user) "are converted into radioelectric waves having different frequencies and amplitudes, which are sent directly to the animal's brain."

¹ See page 6 of the Office Action.

Claim 9

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 9 at least because of its dependency from claim 8.

New Claim

New claim 10 includes features similar to those of amended claim 2. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 10 is patentable at least because of its dependency from claim 8.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/John M. Bird/

John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 19, 2008